

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY LOLIN JIMENEZ, SR.,  
Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:17-cv-197  
Black, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

vs.

FIDELITY ADVISOR C/O FIDELITY, INC.  
Defendant.

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Anthony Lolin Jimenez, Sr., an inmate at the Crowley County Correctional Facility in Olney Springs, Colorado, brings this pro se action against defendant Fidelity Advisor C/O: Fidelity Inc. (Doc. 3). This matter is before the Court on (1) plaintiff's "Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time and From Duty to Confer" (Doc. 15), and (2) plaintiff's "Motion for Clarification" (Doc. 16).

In his first motion, plaintiff moves the Court to order defendant to copy and mail to him with its responsive pleading "all their relevant research concerning CUSIP 316345602." (Doc. 15). Plaintiff alleges he is entitled to this material because defendant requested an extension of time to respond to the complaint so that it could conduct research and respond to its allegations, which defendant described as unclear. (Doc. 10). Plaintiff claims the complaint is unclear because of "official concealment of the instrument's records," and he alleges he is entitled to a copy of any research defendant produces in an effort to clarify the complaint. (Doc. 15). Plaintiff has not shown that he is entitled to the documentation he requests, and there is no authority for the Court to order defendant to provide the documentation to plaintiff with its responsive pleading. The Court will therefore deny plaintiff's request. The Court will also deny plaintiff's request that the Court order defendant or its counsel to confer with him in the future

“on all matters of substance concerning this case.” (Doc. 15). Plaintiff is not entitled to this open-ended relief.

In his motion requesting clarification, plaintiff moves the Court to order defendant to answer questions he has raised in its responsive pleading. There is no authority for the Court to order defendant to answer questions posed by plaintiff in this manner.

Plaintiff’s “Unopposed Motion for Extension of Time and From Duty to Confer” (Doc. 15) and plaintiff’s “Motion for Clarification” (Doc. 16) are therefore **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: 2/5/18

  
Karen L. Litkovitz  
United States Magistrate Judge